

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

TERRI BROOKS-JOSEPH,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF SEATTLE, SEATTLE CITY
LIGHT, LOURDES PODWALL and JOHN
DOE PODWALL and the marital community
composed thereof, SUSAN DAVIDSON and
JOHN DOE DAVIDSON and the marital
community composed thereof, BRITT LUZZI
and JOHN DOE LUZZI and the marital
community composed thereof, SHARON
HUNTER and JOHN DOE HUNTER and the
marital community composed thereof,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:22-cv-01078-RSL

ORDER DENYING
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION

This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff’s “Motion for Reconsideration of Order Granting Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment” (Dkt. # 64). Defendant City of Seattle filed a motion for summary judgment on August 8, 2023. Dkt. # 18. On October 5, 2023, the Court granted the defendant’s motion and dismissed plaintiff’s claims. Dkt. # 62. Plaintiff timely filed a motion for reconsideration pursuant to Local Civil Rule 7(h)(2). Dkt. #64.

Motions for reconsideration are disfavored in this district and will be granted only upon a “showing of manifest error in the prior ruling” or “new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to [the Court’s] attention earlier with reasonable diligence.” LCR 7(h)(1).

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION - 1

1 Manifest error is “plain and indisputable” and “amounts to a complete disregard of the
2 controlling law or the credible evidence in the record.” *Santiago v. Gage*, No. 3:18-CV-05825-
3 RBL, 2020 WL 42246, at *1 (W.D. Wash. Jan. 3, 2020) (quoting Black’s Law Dictionary 622
4 (9th ed. 2009)).

5 Upon reviewing plaintiff’s motion, the Court finds plaintiff has not met her burden.
6 Plaintiff cannot point to manifest error. She reiterates facts and arguments she presented in her
7 initial response to defendant’s motion. Any new facts plaintiff now raises bear no relation to the
8 discriminatory claims she asserts. Therefore, plaintiff’s “Motion for Reconsideration of Order
9 Granting Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment” (Dkt. # 64) is DENIED.

10
11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12
13 DATED this 19th day of March 2024.

14
15
16 

17 Robert S. Lasnik
18 United States District Judge
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28